

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

United States of America, ) CRIMINAL NO. 3:10-580-CMC  
                                  )  
                                  )  
                                 v. ) **OPINION and ORDER**  
                                  )  
                                  )  
Roshell Brown, )  
                                  )  
                                 Defendant. )  
                                  )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Defendant seeks relief in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255, claiming relief pursuant to the Supreme Court's decision in *Dorsey v. United States*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 132 S. Ct. 2321 (2012), and the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010. The Government filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendant, represented by counsel in this matter, has not responded to the Government's motion and the time for doing so has expired.

The court has reviewed the complete record in this case. For the reasons stated in the Government's memorandum in support of its summary judgment motion, which this court finds to be correct and adopts as its findings, the court grants the Government's motion for summary judgment as to Defendant's claim for relief.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Government's Motion for Summary Judgment is **granted**. The motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is *dismissed with prejudice*.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

The governing law provides that:

(c)(2) A certificate of appealability may issue . . . only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.

(c)(3) The certificate of appealability . . . shall indicate which specific issue or issues satisfy the showing required by paragraph (2).

28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find this court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling by the district court is likewise debatable. *See Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 336 (2003); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Rose v. Lee*, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). In this case, the legal standard for the issuance of a certificate of appealability has not been met. Therefore, a certificate of appealability is **denied**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON McGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
March 13, 2013